



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/836,209 | 04/16/2001 | Shao-Tsu Kung | CEIP0024USA | 7409 |

27765 7590 01/19/2005

(NAIPC) NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL PATENT OFFICE
P.O. BOX 506
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

WOZNIAK, JAMES S

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2655

DATE MAILED: 01/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action | Application No. 09/836,209 | Applicant(s) KUNG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner James S. Wozniak | Art Unit 2655 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-8.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


DAVID L. OMETZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are not convincing. The applicant argues that Oberteuffer et al (U.S. Patent: 6,438,523) fails to teach a list that is an intersection of characters common to a first list and a second list, however as was noted in the previous office action from 9/8/2004 (Page 3), Oberteuffer teaches a combination mode of recognition utilizing both speech and handwriting recognition. The apparatus disclosed by Oberteuffer first produces recognition candidates from a speech recognition process and then supplements that process with the use of handwriting recognition candidates (Col. 5, Lines 1-12). Since the handwriting recognition candidates are used to "select from among recognition candidates identified by [a speech recognition mode]" (Col. 5, Lines 8-12), candidates from the handwriting recognition step would not be considered if they are not found in the speech recognition candidate list. Thus, the final list of recognition candidates contains elements which are common to both lists and therefore is an intersection of the two lists. Therefore, the prior position of record is maintained. Also, as per the applicant's request of a reference supporting the obviousness of the above limitation (Amendment, Page 5), no reference is required since no official notice has been taken with respect to Claim 1 and Oberteuffer explicitly teaches the intersection of the two recognition lists for the reasons noted above.